

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being transmitted facsimile to 703-872-9310
addressed to: Commissioner of Patents,
P. O. Box 1450, Arlington V.A. on September
9, 2003.

Steve Moore
Name
Signature

#14
9-11-03
Case CM2492

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of :
Peter Robert Foley et al. : Confirmation No. 2076
Serial No.: 09/910,281 : Group Art Unit 1751
Filed: July 19, 2001 : Examiner: G. Delcotto
Title: Cleaning Composition

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2003 (Paper No. 11).

I. Introduction.

Claims 51-91 are pending and stand rejected. The Office Action states that priority has not been granted since the Applicant has not filed certified copies of the priority applications. A number of the objections/rejections in the prior Office Action have been withdrawn. Claims 51-61, 63, 70-72, 74-79, 81-85, and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), or alternatively, under Section 103(a). Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 88-91 were separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 51-91 were also provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

II. Priority.

The Applicants will order certified copies of the priority documents, and will submit certified copies of the priority documents when they are received.

II. The 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)/103(a) Rejection.

Claims 51-61, 63, 70-72, 74-79, 81-85, and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), or alternatively, under Section 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,929,007 issued to Feng.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Feng reference discloses compositions having a surface tension that is greater than 24.5 mN/m. Among other things, the Feng reference does not teach or disclose, explicitly (or inherently) compositions having a surface tension less than about 24.5 mN/m.

III. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections.

A. Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80.

Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Feng reference discloses compositions having a surface tension that is greater than 24.5 mN/m. Among other things, the Feng reference does not teach or disclose, explicitly (or inherently) compositions having a surface tension less than about 24.5 mN/m.

B. Claims 88-91.

Claims 88-91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng as applied to Claims 51-85 and 87, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,001,789 issued to Trinh, et al.

Claims 88-91 are not obvious in view of the Feng and Trinh, et al. references for the same reasons that the group of claims discussed previously are not obvious in view of the Feng reference. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

IV. The Double Patenting Rejection.


Claims 51-91 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of five other copending patent applications.

The Applicants will consider submitting a terminal disclaimer herein to obviate this double patenting rejection when allowable subject matter is indicated.

V. Summary.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
PETER ROBERT FOLEY, ET AL.

By 
Jeffrey V. Bamber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597

September 9, 2003
Customer No. 27752
CM-2492 Response 9-2003.doc

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 10 2003

OFFICIAL